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#### Abstract

This prospective study was conducted in an attempt to find out a method of clinical diagnosis of Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever with high accuracy and coverage. A clinical picture of all cases admitted with 3 days fever of unknown origin and positive tourniquet test was studied.

The cardinal signs and symptoms i.e. liver enlargenent, thrombocyte count, hematocrit, spontaneous bleeding such as epistaxis, petechiae, hematoma and henatemesis, were thoroughly studied from the day of admission up to the sixth day of illness.

Blood was drawn into filter-paper disks for serologic examination on the day of admission, then 5, and 10 days thereafter.

Based on a series of serological tests, the patients were grouped into confirmed and false DHF.

Liver enlargement was found in both groups, but only in the confirmed DHF group was it significantly related to the day of illness ( $r=0.45$, with probably error of 0.03).


[^0]Thrombocyte count, hematocrit of less than 45, and epistaxis were insignificantly different in both groups. But petechiae, melena, hematemesis and hematocrit of 45 or more, or with an increase of 5, and progressive enlargement of the liver, were frequently found in DHF.

From this study, a scoring system with the following interpretation is proposed: A total score of: $0-3:$ non $D H F$.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 4-6: } 6: \\ \text { more than 6: } 6: & \text { sefinite DHF } D H F\end{array}$
more than 6: definite DHF.

## Introduction

During the last decade, DHF epidemic had occurred in various parts of Indonesia and at present almost all provinces have been infected by this serious disease, so that it has become an important public health problem of the country.

Dengue Shock Syndrome constitutes the one and only serious variant threaten:ng the life of the patient.

It has been shown (Munir and Husada, 1973) that the mortality rate among DHF cases admitted without shock is lower than those admitted with DSS aither by referral or mon-referral. Thus it is of paramount importance that DHF patients be ciosely obsorved and if necessary hospitalized. This necessitates the identification of the disease in its carly stage.
Howcyor, due to the unspecific symptems and signs, it is very difficult indeed to arnive at the correct diagnosis. There are criteria (Nimmannitya, 1975; WHO, 1975; Sumarmo et al., 1975) which are usually used to diagnose DHF clinicalsy and which are recommended to avoid over diagnosis that should be taken into consideration. It certainly would be very ideal if we were able to diagnosis DHF clinically as accurately as possible without over or undor diag. nosis.

The objective of this study is to analyse symptoms and signs of DHF relating to clinical diagnosis and to try to
find out a combination of symptoms and signs which can be ușed as critenia in the clinical diagnosis of the disease.

## Material and methods

All patients admitted to the Pediat. ric Department of Gunung Wenang Ge, neral Hospital from January 1, 1976 up to October 31, 1979 with the diagnosis of DHF were subjected to this prospective study.

Generally they suffered from acute fever of unknown origin for an average of 1-2 days before admission, and showed a poss:tive Tourniquet test.
From the day of admission on, frequent daily examination and observations were made on: body temperature, bleeding manifustations (petechiae, ecchymosis, epistaxis or other bleeding tendencies), hepatomegaly, hematocrit, platelet count, etc.

Blood was drawn into filter-paper disks for serologic test; firstly on admission, then after 5 and 10 days. Alll these were noted on a prepared record sheet and were kept in each patient's file.
Based on the results of the serologic tests, an evaluation for the symptoms and signs was made. They were complied acconling to the day of illness, beginning from day 2 untill day 6 . The hematocrit was divided into 3 categories; less than $40,40-45$, and more than 45 . The platelet count was grouped into higher or lower than $100.000 / \mathrm{cml}$. Liver measurements were grouped into
$0,1-2,2-4,4-6$, and more than 6 cm below the costal arch.

Spontaneous bleeding was grouped into petechiae or hematoma, epistaxis, gumbleeding, and haenatemesis or melena.
A comparative study was made of serologic positive or confirmed DHF and the negative or false group at each similar day of dillness.

Patients, admitted on the third day or later, those under 2 years of age and those who died within their six days of illness were excluded from this study.

## Results

There were 74 cases in the confirmed DHF group and 63 in false DHF group with the sex distributions, moan age. and body woight shown in table 1.

TABLE 1: Sex distribution, mean age and body weight.

| Factors | Confirmed DHF Group | False DHF | Significancy |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male/Female |  |  |  |
| Mean body Weight $\pm \mathrm{SD}$ | $20 / 44$ | $27 / 36$ | $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ |
| Mean age $\pm \mathrm{SD}$ | $87 / 12 \pm 2.69$ | $79 / 12 \pm 2.9$ | $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ |

Table 2 shows the differences in percentages of the various liver measurements of the confirmed DHF group and false DHF group on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5 th and 6th day of illiness.
On the second day of illiness there was no difference in percentages of the various liver measurements between the confirmed DHF and false DHF groups.
On the contrary, an obvious difference was encountered in liver measurements
on the 3rd day and beyond of illness between both groups.
Progressive liver enlargement was seen only in a confirmed DHF group, while in the false DHF group liver measurcments were constant throughout the period of illness.

The liver measurements of 2-4 and $4-6 \mathrm{~cm}$ below the costal arch were commonly seen in confirmed DHF group. beginning on the third day of illness and beyond.

TABLE 2: Liver measurement in confirmed and false DHF group.

| Days of illness | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DHF } \\ & \text { or } \\ & \text { false } \end{aligned}$ | Liver measurement below costal arch (in cm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0 | 1-2 | 3-4 | 4-6 | 6 | Total | Total of both Groups |
| 2 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (31 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | 74 | 237 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (23 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | 63 |  |
| 3 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (28 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (32 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | 74 | 137 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | 63 |  |
| 4 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (13 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (28 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | 74 | 137 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (18 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | 63 |  |
| 5 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (12 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (39 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (36 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | 137 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | 63 |  |
| 6 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (12,2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5,4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (36,5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (40,5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5,4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | 137 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (38,1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (34,9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (25,4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1,6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | 63 |  |

r DHF $=0.425$, with probable error of 0.0287 .
r ................. 14. $\times$ probable error .............. $\rightarrow$ significant
r False $=-0.054$ with probable error of 0.0350 .
Probable error > r ..a..................... $\rightarrow$ not significant.

Table 3 shows that the petechiae or while melena or haematemesis or gumhaematoma were commonly seen in the confirmed DHF group, beginning on the second day up to 6 day of illness,

TABLE 3: Types of spontaneous bleeding in relation to days of illness.

|  |  | Petechiae <br> Haematoma | Melena/ <br> Hematemesis | Gumbleeding | Epistaxis | Total | Total of Both Groups |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (12 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 36 | 52 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 16 |  |
| 3 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 39 | 57 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (24 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 18 |  |
| 4 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{1}{(1 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 44 | 61 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | $\stackrel{1}{(2 \%)}$ | 17 |  |
| 5 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{1}{(1 \%)}$ | $\stackrel{2}{(3 \%)}$ | 45 | 56 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (16 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 11 |  |
| 6 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (46 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 40 | 48 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (11 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 8 |  |

Table 4 shows that thrombocytopenia especially on the day 3, 4 and 5 of illwith a thrombocyte count of 100.000 / ness. However, thrombocytopenia was cml , or less, was more commonly enco- found only in $18.32 \%$ of the confirmed untered in the confirmed DHF group, DHF.

TABLE 4: Thrombocyte count in relation to days of illness.

| Days of illness |  | Thrombocyte count |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\leqslant 100.000$ | $>100.000$ | Total | p |
| 2 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (18 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ (82 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (92 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  |
| 3 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (78 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (92 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  |
| 4 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (70 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ (94 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  |
| 5 | False | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (32 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (68 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |
|  | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ (94 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  |
| 6 | False | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (81 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 74 | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |
|  | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ (94 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  |

In table 5 it can be seen that there is hematocrit greater than 45 and an inno difference in the percentage of hematocrit of 40 or less, and $40-45$ between both groups throughout the study. But
crease of 5 or more duning the follow up were obviously different from the third day up to the 6th day of illness.

TABLE 5: Hematocrit levels in relation to days of illness

| Days of illness | Cases | Hematocrit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\leqslant 40$ | $40-45$ | $i>45$ | Increase of 5 | Total |
| 2 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (68 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (32 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 74 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (65 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 63 |
| 3 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (57 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (34 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 74 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (65 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 63 |
| 4 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (52 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (32 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (16 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 10 | 74 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (62 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 63 |
| 5 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (48 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 15 | 74 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (62 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 63 |
| 6 | DHF | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (58 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (34 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 74 |
|  | False | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (65 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 63 |

## Discussion

The differences of sex, age and body weight between the study and the control group are not significant so that from a statistical point of view a comparison between them is valid.
Based on the fact that DSS mostly develops on the 4th and 5th day of ill-
ness (Munir and Husada 1978; Sumarmo et al., 1975; Tjandra and Munir, 1976) it was decided to compare the 2 groups only from day 2 until day 6.
A clinical diagnosis is significant only when made pnior to the development of DSS, so that precautious measures can be undertaken.

FIG. 1: Percentages of shock in relation to sex and days of illness


Establishing a clinical diagnosis of DHF. especially during the early stage of illness is not quite easy.
It is brought about by the unspecific symptoms and signs which have also been documented by many investigators (Kho et al., 1972; Moeljono et al., 1975; Sunoto et al., 1975; Sumadmo et al., 1975; Tjandra and Munir, 1976). The symptoms and signs become more obvious as the disease progresses.
The alertness to a proper diagnosis of DHF on day 3,4 and 5 of illness should be increased, since $30-50 \%$ of the confirmed DHF will develop into DSS (Figure 1).
Applying the criteria commonly used woulil cover only a small percentage of the confirmed DHF

It would be harmful if the vast majority of cases are lost from the diagnosis, since more than one third of them daveloped into shock. By using a throm-
bocyte count of less than 100,000 as one of the criteria, only around $18-32 \%$ of the cases throughout the illness will be covered.

In spite of thrombocytopenia with the thrombocyte count of 100,000 or less, which was found not only in a. confirmed DHF but also in false DHF group. the percentages of both groups throughout the days of study were significantly different. Thrombocytopenia may also be found in other bacterial, parasitic infection such as malaria and other viral diseases with viremia.

On the otherhand, fever and tourniquet test used as the critenia for diagnosis as shown in this study will cover all cases of DHF, but this method revealed over-diagnosis, 63 out of 137 ( $46 \%$ ) were non DHF. Over-diagnosis will increase a demand for hospital beds.
Only a slight difference was encountered in the liver measurement, petechiae,

FIG. 2: Mean liver sizes in relation to days of illness,

thrombocyte count and hematocrit on the second day of the illness between the 2 groups. However, an obvious difference began on the third day becoming more obvious on the 4th and 5th day of ililiness.

A great variation of liver measurement was one of the most important findings the study. But progressive enlargement was one of the most important findings in the confirmed DHF to support the clinical diagnosis of DHF. The mean liver sizes in confirmed DHF group increase by the increase of the day of illlness up to 6 days, while in false DHF group they are almost constant. (Figure 2).

Hematocrit of 40 or less and 40-45 were not significant since there were no differences in percentage betweon the confirmed and the fallse DHF group. Hematocrit of 45 and an increase of hematocrit of 5, are determinants, but they cover only a small number of cases throughout the illness.

Increase of hematocrit of 5 or more occurred only in the confirmed DHF group on the day 3,4 and 5 , which coincides with the day of the occurrance of shock.

Spontaneous bleeding such as petechiae, melena, hematemesis and gumbleeding were found mostly in a confirmed DHF group, while epistaxis was not so common. It is easily seen therefore in this study that the symptoms and signs are less specific, and vary from case to case. To avoid overdiagnosis or
undendiagnosis, one should have a uniform method for the direction of the possibilility of cardinal symptoms and signs.
Based on this study a scoring system was developed with items as follows:

## Liver measurements:

- progressive enlargement of the liver
-6 cm below the costal arch -3
$-4-6 \mathrm{~cm}$ below the costal arch - 2
-2.4 cm below the costal arch -1
-2 cm or less below the costal arch
$-0$
Thrombocyte:
- more than $100.000 / \mathrm{mm}^{3} \quad$ -
$-100.000 / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ or less $\quad-1$
Hematocrit :
- less than 45 -
- 45 or more - 2
- increase of 5 or more - 2
-shock -3
Spontaneous bleeding:
- epistaxis
$-0$
- petechiae/hematoma — 1
- hematemesis/melena - 2

The scoring system did not only unify the method of clinical diagnosis, but it could also differentiate a confirmed with the false DHF on day 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the illness.
Thus it is very helpful in making an early diagnosis for the purpose of public health decision.
A score 0-3: a false DHF, although it also covered a very small number of confirmed DHF.

A score 4-6: suspected DHF. 6 or more : definite DHF.

A thorough and accurate daily examination for several consecutive days and the days of illness are the paramount important factors determining the achievement of the highest rate of accuracy of this scoring system.

It is very important to note that the higher the score, the higher the possibility of DHF will be, but the coverage become less.

The accuracy and the : coverage will be increased by increasing the days of illness.

Due to geographical variation, racial factors, ecological condition, and many other factors which might influence the clinical picture of DHF, it is very important indeed to evaluate the effectiveness of this scoring system compared with the critenia commonly used. It is possible that the criteria properly used en one region might not necessanily be applicable in another.
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